



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

**Notwithstanding Occupancy of Premises by Others.**—Under Prohibition Law, § 28, the finding of intoxicating liquor on defendant's premises is prima facie evidence of the violation of the Prohibition Law, notwithstanding occupancy of premises by others.

[Ed. Note.—For other cases, see 8 Va.-W. Va. Enc. Dig. 34.]

Error to Corporation Court of Norfolk.

Edward Moore was convicted of violating the Prohibition Law, and he brings error. Affirmed.

*Tomlin & Maupin*, of Norfolk, for plaintiff in error.

*John R. Saunders, Atty. Gen., J. D. Hank, Jr., Asst. Atty. Gen., and Leon M. Bazile, Second Asst. Atty. Gen.*, for the Commonwealth.

---

MOORE *v.* COMMONWEALTH.

March 16, 1922.

[111 S. E. 128.]

**1. Intoxicating Liquors (§ 236 (20)\*)—Evidence Held Insufficient to Prove Corpus Delicti in Prosecution for Transporting Liquor.**—In prosecution for unlawfully transporting intoxicating liquor in excess of one quart, evidence held insufficient to sustain conviction in that it failed to prove the corpus delicti.

[Ed. Note.—For other cases, see 8 Va.-W. Va. Enc. Dig. 34.]

**2. Criminal Law (§ 535 (2)\*)—Defendant's Extrajudicial Confession Not Alone Sufficient to Establish Corpus Delicti.**—Even a confession by the accused, which is extrajudicial, that he committed the offense with which he is charged, is not, alone and uncorroborated, adequate proof to establish the corpus delicti.

[Ed. Note.—For other cases, see 4 Va. W. Va. Enc. Dig. 78.]

Error to Circuit Court, Scott County.

*W. S. Cox*, of Gate City, for plaintiff in error.

*John R. Saunders, Atty. Gen., J. D. Hank, Jr., Asst. Atty. Gen., and Leon M. Bazile, Second Asst. Atty. Gen.*, for the Commonwealth.

---

CHRISTIAN *v.* COMMONWEALTH.

March 30, 1922.

[111 S. E. 130.]

**1. Indictment and Information (§ 75 (1)\*)—Omission of Commas Not Demurrable Defect.**—Demurrer to indictment under Prohibition Act, § 7, because a comma was omitted after accused's name, as well as after the word "indictment," was properly overruled.

[Ed. Note.—For other cases, see 7 Va.-W. Va. Enc. Dig. 455.]

**2. Intoxicating Liquors (§ 134\*)—Liquid Need Not Contain Alcohol to Be "Ardent Spirits" within Prohibition Act.**—Under Prohibition

---

\*For other cases see same topic and KEY-NUMBER in all Key-Numbered Digests and Indexes.

Act, §§ 1, 49, 58, liquids, mixtures, and preparations which will produce intoxication, as defined in the act, are "ardent spirits" condemned by the act whether or not they contain alcohol.

[Ed. Note.—For other definitions, see Words and Phrases, First and Second Series, Ardent Spirits. For other cases, see 8 Va.-W. Va. Enc. Dig. 1.]

Error to Circuit Court, Mathews County.

Julian T. Christian was convicted of violating the prohibition act, and brings error. Affirmed.

*C. S. Smith, Jr.*, of Gloucester, for plaintiff in error.

*John R. Saunders, Atty. Gen., J. D. Hank, Jr., Asst. Atty. Gen., and Leon M. Bazile, Second Asst. Atty. Gen.*, for the Commonwealth.

#### BOWEN *v.* COMMONWEALTH.

March 16, 1922.

[111 S. E. 131.]

**1. Jury (§ 82 (2)\*)—Misdemeanant May Waive Irregularities in Organization and Constitution of Jury.**—Though the guaranty (Const. 1902, § 8) of the right to a jury trial applies to misdemeanors as well as felonies, one tried for a misdemeanor may waive all irregularities in the organization and constitution of the jury.

[Ed. Note.—For other cases, see 9 Va.-W. Va. Enc. Dig. 20.]

**2. Criminal Law (§ 895\*)—Accused May Waive Anything Except Jurisdiction.**—Accused May Waive any matter not relating to the court's jurisdiction.

[Ed. Note.—For other cases, see 4 Va.-W. Va. Enc. Dig. 65.]

**3. Jury (§ 29 (5)\*)—Irregularity in Trial of Misdemeanant before Jury of Seven Waived by Failure to Object; "Impaneled."**—Under Code 1919, § 4895, declaring that no irregularity in impaneling jurors shall be cause for setting aside a verdict unless objection was made before the jury was sworn, any irregularity in trying a misdemeanor case before a jury of seven, instead of five, as required by section 4927, was waived, where defendant made no objection and challenged none of the jurors; a jury being "impaneled" when ready to try the case (quoting Words and Phrases, First Series, Impanel).

[Ed. Note.—For other cases, see 9 Va.-W. Va. Enc. Dig. 20.]

Error to Corporation Court of Buena Vista.

W. R. Bowen was convicted of petit larceny, and he brings error. Affirmed.

*John Dabney Smith*, of Buena Vista, for plaintiff in error.

*John R. Saunders, Atty. Gen., J. D. Hank, Jr., Asst. Atty. Gen., and Leon M. Bazile, Second Asst. Atty. Gen.*, for the Commonwealth.

---

\*For other cases see same topic and KEY-NUMBER in all Key-Numbered Digests and Indexes.